APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/843,548	04/26/2001	Koichi Nakamura	JP919990227US1 (590.049)	9240

			EXAMINER
35195	7590	01/10/2005	PHILLIPS, HASSAN A

FERENCE & ASSOCIATES
400 BROAD STREET
PITTSBURGH, PA 15143

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2151	

DATE MAILED: 01/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/843,548	NAKAMURA, KOICHI
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Hassan Phillips	2151	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _03 November 2004_.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is

closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1-16_ is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) _1-16_ is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a) ☐ All　b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

　　　1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
　　　2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
　　　3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage

　　　　　application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This action is in response to amendments received on November 3, 2004.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. After consideration to the amendments made to claims 3, 6, 8, and 15, the Examiner has withdrawn the rejections to the claims under 35 USC 112.

2. The Applicant failed to amend claim 10. Therefore, the rejection of claim 10 under 35 USC 112 stands.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed November 3, 2004, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that:

   a) Simonoff fails to teach an "owner identifier [which] can be discriminated from owner identifiers of other objects"; and,

   b) There is no motivation to combine Suda or Itakura with the teachings of Simonoff.

Regarding item a), the Examiner respectfully submits that the Applicant has misinterpreted the prior art of record. In col. 18, lines 12-31, Simonoff teaches each displayed object having a "wrapper" around it. This wrapper contains owner identifier

information such as "...the user and White Board client that created the wrapper

object..." (see col. 18, lines 32-36). Thus, referring back to col. 18, lines 12-31, when a

user creates an object, such as a text object, to be displayed, the users is discriminated

from owners of other text objects by means of the identifier contained within the objects

wrapper, (also see col. 16, lines 25-29).

Regarding item b), In response to applicant's argument that there is no

suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can

only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce

the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so

found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one

of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir.

1988)and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case,

modifying Simonoff with the teachings of Suda would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art because Simonoff attempts to provide a secure means for

identifying clients in a collaborated work area, (see Simonoff col. 8, lines 14-40). The

teachings of Suda provide an effective alternate, if not improved, means for Simonoff to

do this, (see Suda col. 1 line 66 through col. 2, line 19). Modifying Simonoff with Itakura

would provide an effective means for deleting an image received over the network

according to a timer operation (see Itakura col. 10, line 53 through col. 11, line 5). The

knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art would make modifying

Simonoff with Itakura to show deleting the display of the owner identifier, or obtained

object on the screen according to a timer operation obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, (see Itakura col. 2, line 54 through col. 3, line 15).

Furthermore, the Examiner has interpreted the claim language as broadly as possible. It is also the Examiner's position that Applicant has not yet submitted claims drawn to limitations, which define the operation and apparatus of Applicant's disclosed invention in a manner that distinguishes over the prior art.

Failure for Applicant to significantly narrow definition/scope of the claims implies the Applicant intends broad interpretation be given to the claims. The Examiner has interpreted the claims with scope parallel to the Applicant in the response and reiterated the need for Applicant to define the claimed invention more clearly and distinctly. Accordingly the references supplied by the examiner in the previous office action covers the claimed limitations. The rejections are thus sustained. Applicant is requested to review the prior art of record for further consideration.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) The invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 11, 12, 16, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Simonoff, U.S. patent 6,463,460.

3. In considering claim 1, Simonoff teaches a computer system comprising:

   a) A plurality of user systems connected to each other, each user system being adapted to display a work area on a display screen, alternatively a plurality of user systems connected to each other through a computer network, (col. 8, lines 14-40); wherein each of the user systems includes:

   b) A collaboration work controller having a user management table for registering a node identification code given for each of the user systems and an owner identifier related to the node identification code, and an object management table for registering object information related to the node identification code, (col. 18, lines 32-36); and,

   c) An obtainer for obtaining, based on an event entry for an object, the node identification code related to the object by referring to the object management table, obtaining the owner identifier related to the obtained node identification code by referring to the user management table, and displaying the object on the screen in a manner that the obtained owner identifier can be discriminated from owner identifiers of other objects, (col. 18, lines 12-31).

4. In considering claim 2, Simonoff further teaches the event entry being a
drawing operation carried out by the owner of the object, alternatively a selection
operation carried out by a user other than the owner of the object. See col. 15, lines 55-
67, col. 16, lines 1-20.

5. In considering claim 4, Simonoff teaches an editor for performing an editing
operation including copying, movement deletion and others for the obtained object. See
col. 18, lines 12-31.

6. In considering claim 5, Simonoff teaches registering security level information
related to the node identification code, and the editing operation being permitted within
a range compliant with the security level information. See col. 18, lines 12-31.

7. In considering claim 7, Simonoff further teaches a session controller for
controlling a session for each collaboration work, wherein the session controller
includes a session management table for registering a session, identification code for
identifying the session, a user identification code for identifying a user taking part in the
session, and a node identification code of the user system used by the user, and the
session control controller refers to the session management table, and transmits the
data to the other user systems taking part in the session regarding all sessions
registering the user identification code contained in data sent from the user. See col.
24, lines 53-67, and col. 25, lines 1-2.

8.   In considering claims 9 and 16, Simonoff teaches a method and storage

medium for identifying a collaboration work object, the object having been created

based on collaboration work by using a computer system having a plurality of user

systems connected to each other, alternatively a plurality of user systems connected to

each other through a computer network, comprising the steps of:

        a)   Causing one of the user systems to store object data contained in

           collaboration work data received from the other user systems in an object

           management table by relating the data to a node identification code of

           each of the other user systems, and to display an object thereof on a

           screen of the user system, obtaining, when one of owners taking part in

           the collaboration work is selected, a node identification code given for a

           user system of the selected owner by referring to a user management

           table of the user system, obtaining objects related to the obtained node

           identification code by referring to the object management table, and

           displaying all the obtained objects on the screen in a manner of

           discrimination from other objects, (col. 18, lines 12-43).

9.   In considering claim 11, Simonoff teaches performing an editing work

including copying, movement deletion and others for the obtained object. See col. 18,

lines 12-31.

10. In considering claim 12, Simonoff teaches registering security level

information related to the node identification code, and the editing operation being

permitted within a range compliant with the security level information. See col. 18, lines

12-31.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 3, 8, 10, 13, 15, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Simonoff in view of Suda, U.S. patent 6,639,996.

3. In considering claim 3, although the disclosed system of Simonoff shows

substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to expressly show:

     a) An owner identifier superposed on an object.

Nevertheless, Suda teaches an image processing apparatus comprising:

     a) An owner identifier superposed on an object, (col. 3, lines 54-58).

Thus given the teachings of Suda, it would have been apparent to one of

ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Simonoff to show superposing the

owner identifier on an object. This would have provided another means for preventing

fraudulent usage of the system, and for identifying the owners of objects that are being displayed to the plurality of users on the system, Suda, col. 1, lines 66-67, and col. 2, lines 1-19.

4. In considering claims 8 and 15, Simonoff teaches a method and storage medium for identifying a collaboration work object, the object having been created based on collaboration work by using a computer system having a plurality of user systems connected to each other, alternatively a plurality of user systems connected to each other through a computer network, comprising the steps of:

   a) Causing one of the user systems to store object data contained in collaboration work data received from the other user systems in an object management table by relating the data to a node identification code of each of the other user systems, and to display an object thereof on a screen of the user system, obtaining the node identification code by referring to the object management table when the object displayed on the screen is selected, and obtaining an owner identifier related to the obtained node identification code by referring to the user management table of the user system, (col. 18, lines 12-43).

Although the disclosed system of Simonoff shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to expressly show:

   b) An owner identifier superposed on an object.

Nevertheless, Suda teaches an image processing apparatus comprising:

b) An owner identifier superposed on an object, (col. 3, lines 54-58).

Thus given the teachings of Suda, it would have been apparent to one of

ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Simonoff to show superposing the

owner identifier on an object. This would have provided another means for preventing

fraudulent usage of the system, and for identifying the owners of objects that are being

displayed to the plurality of users on the system, Suda, col. 1, lines 66-67, and col. 2,

lines 1-19.

5. In considering claim 10, although the disclosed system of Simonoff shows

substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to expressly show:

a) An owner identifier superposed on an object.

Nevertheless, Suda teaches an image processing apparatus comprising:

a) An owner identifier superposed on an object.

Thus given the teachings of Suda, it would have been apparent to one of

ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Simonoff to show superposing the

owner identifier on an object. This would have provided another means for preventing

fraudulent usage of the system, and for identifying the owners of objects that are being

displayed to the plurality of users on the system, Suda, col. 1, lines 66-67, and col. 2,

lines 1-19.

6. In considering claim 13, Simonoff further teaches:

    a) Transmitting, when any one of the plurality of user systems starts

       collaboration work, user information containing a node identification code

       thereof and an owner identifier to the other user systems, (col. 18, lines

       32-43); and,

    b) Causing the other user systems having received the user information to

       store in each user management table, (col. 17, lines 57-59).

7. Claims 6, 14, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Simonoff in view of Itakura, U.S. patent 6,639,608.

8. In considering claim 6, although the disclosed system of Simonoff shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to expressly show:

    a) Deleting the display of the owner identifier, or obtained object, according

       to a timer operation.

Nevertheless, Itakura teaches a system for displaying images received from a network comprising:

    a) Deleting an image received over the network according to a timer

       operation, (col. 10, lines 53-67, col. 11, lines 1-5).

Thus given the teachings of Itakura, it would have been apparent to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Simonoff to show deleting the display of the owner identifier, or obtained object on the screen according to a timer operation. This would have made a user requesting a particular object effectively aware of who

owns the object for a specified period of time, Itakura, col. 2, lines 54-67, and col. 3,

lines 1-15.

9. In considering claim 14, although the disclosed system of Simonoff shows

substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to expressly show:

> a) Deleting the display of the owner identifier, or obtained object, according
>
>   to a timer operation.

Nevertheless, Itakura teaches a system for displaying images received from a

network comprising:

> a) Deleting an image received over the network according to a timer
>
>   operation, (col. 10, lines 53-67, col. 11, lines 1-5).

Thus given the teachings of Itakura, it would have been apparent to one of

ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Simonoff to show deleting the display

of the owner identifier, or obtained object on the screen according to a timer operation.

This would have made a user requesting a particular object effectively aware of who

owns the object for a specified period of time, Itakura, col. 2, lines 54-67, and col. 3,

lines 1-15.

Conclusion

1. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of

time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

2. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from

the examiner should be directed to Hassan Phillips whose telephone number is (571)

272-3940. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Zarni Maung can be reached on (571) 272-3939. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ZARNI MAUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINEF